

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated May 3, 2006. Claims 19 to 39 are pending in the application, of which Claims 19, 24, 29, 34, 36 and 38 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 19 to 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 4,843,405 (Morikawa) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,965,451 (Ogg). Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Turning to specific claim language, amended independent Claim 19 is directed to an information processing apparatus which includes a discrimination unit adapted to discriminate whether a first print mode in which a valid print area is not widened is designated or a second print mode in which the valid print area is widened is designated; and a transmission unit adapted, if the discrimination unit discriminates that the first print mode is designated, to transmit to a printer a command showing that the first print mode is set and a drawing command formed such that drawing positions are represented by coordinates relative to an origin that is defined at a specific position in a print sheet, and if the discrimination unit discriminates that the second print mode is designated, to transmit to the printer a command showing that the second print mode is set and a drawing command formed such that drawing positions are represented by coordinates relative to an origin that is defined at an edge of a print sheet.

Claim 34 as amended is directed to a printer comprising a discrimination unit and a drawing processing unit. The discrimination unit discriminates whether a first print mode in which a valid print area is not widened is designated or a second print mode in which the valid print area is widened is designated, based on print data received from a host computer. If the discrimination unit discriminates that the first print mode is designated, the drawing processing

unit performs drawing processing for the received print data by setting a specific position in a print sheet as a drawing origin. On the other hand, if the discrimination unit discriminates that the second print mode is designated, the drawing processing unit performs drawing processing for the received print data by setting an edge of a print sheet as a drawing origin.

In contrast, Morikawa discloses performing a printing process for data supplied from a host computer on the basis of a flag indicating either a portrait mode or a landscape mode. Ogg discloses switching between landscape and portrait modes and rotating images such that the images are continuously printed without blanks.

However, Morikawa and Ogg, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest transmitting to the printer a command showing that a first print mode in which a valid print area is not widened is set and a drawing command formed such that drawing positions are represented by coordinates relative to an origin that is defined at a specific position in a print sheet, if the first print mode is designated, and transmitting to the printer a command showing that a second print mode in which the valid print area is widened is set and a drawing command formed such that drawing positions are represented by coordinates relative to an origin that is defined at an edge of a print sheet, if the second print mode is designated, as featured in Claim 19.

In addition, Morikawa and Ogg, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest performing drawing processing for print data received from the host computer by setting a specific position in a print sheet as a drawing origin, if a first print mode in which a valid print area is not widened is designated, and performing drawing processing for the received print data by setting an edge of a print sheet as a drawing origin, if a second print mode in which the valid print area is widened is designated, as featured in Claim 34.

In light of the deficiencies of Morikawa and Ogg as discussed above, Applicant submits that Claims 19 and 34 are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

Claims 24 and 29 are directed to a method and a computer-readable medium, respectively, substantially in accordance with the apparatus of Claim 19. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claims 24 and 29 are also in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

Claims 36 and 38 are directed to a method and a computer-readable medium, respectively, substantially in accordance with the apparatus of Claim 34. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claims 36 and 38 are also in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

The other pending claims in this application are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed allowable for the same reasons.

Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank L. Cire
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 42,419

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 117963v1